arXiv:1101.5078v4 [math.AC] 5 Dec 2012

NEW ESTIMATES OF HILBERT-KUNZ MULTIPLICITIES FOR LOCAL RINGS OF FIXED DIMENSION

IAN M. ABERBACH AND FLORIAN ENESCU

Abstract. We present results on the Watanabe-Yoshida conjecture for the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity of a local ring of positive characteristic. By improving on a "volume estimate" giving a lower bound for Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity, we obtain the conjecture when the ring either has Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity less than or equal to five, or dimension less than or equal to six. For non-regular rings with fixed dimension, a new lower bound for the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity is obtained.

1. Introduction

Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$ be a local ring of positive characteristic p. If I is an ideal in R, then $I^{[q]} = (i^q : i \in I)$, where $q = p^e$ is a power of the characteristic. For an $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal I, one can consider the Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity and the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity of I with respect to R.

Definition 1.1. Let I be an $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal in $(R, \mathfrak{m})$.

1. *The Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity of R at I* is defined by $\mathrm{e}(I) = \mathrm{e}(I, R) := \lim_{n\to\infty} d! \dfrac{\lambda(R/I^n)}{n^d}$. The limit exists and it is positive.

2. *The Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity of R at I* is defined by $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(I) = \mathrm{e}_{HK}(I, R) := \lim_{q\to\infty} \dfrac{\lambda(R/I^{[q]})}{q^d}$. Monsky has shown that this limit exists and is positive.

It is known that for parameter ideals I, one has $\mathrm{e}(I) = \mathrm{e}_{HK}(I)$. The following sequence of inequalities is also known to hold:

$$\max\{1, \frac{1}{d!}\,\mathrm{e}(I)\} \leq \mathrm{e}_{HK}(I) \leq \mathrm{e}(I)$$

for every $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal I.

We call a local ring R *formally unmixed* if $\hat{R}$ is equidimensional and $\mathrm{Min}(\hat{R}) = \mathrm{Ass}(\hat{R})$, that is, $\dim(\hat{R}/P) = \dim(\hat{R})$ for all its minimal primes P, and all associated primes of $\hat{R}$ are minimal. Nagata calls such rings *unmixed*. However, throughout our paper, a local unmixed ring is a local ring R that is equidimensional and $\mathrm{Min}(R) = \mathrm{Ass}(R)$.

In this paper we will examine lower bounds for formally unmixed nonregular local rings R of dimension d and prime characteristic p.

Definition 1.2. For $d \geq 1$, let m_d be the real numbers such that

---

The second author was partially supported by the Young Investigator Grants H98230-07-1-0034 and H98230-10-1-0166 from the National Security Agency.

$$\sec(x)+\tan(x)=1+\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} m_d x^d,$$

where $\mid x \mid< \frac{\pi}{2}$.

The following conjecture will be central to our paper:

Conjecture 1.3 (Watanabe-Yoshida, see [25], Conjecture 4.2 for a more general form)**.** *Let* $d \geq 1, p > 2$. *Let* $K=\overline{\mathbf{F}_p}$ *and*

$$R_{p,d}=\frac{K[[x_0,\dots x_d]]}{(x_0^2+\cdots+x_d^2)},$$

Let $(R,\mathfrak{m},K)$ *be a formally unmixed nonregular local ring of dimension* d.
Then

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{p,d}) \geq 1+m_d.$$

Remark 1.4. The reader should note that the statement $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{p,d}) \geq 1+m_d$ is part of the conjecture.

This is known for $d \leq 6$, due to Yoshida [27]. In fact, $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{p,5})=\frac{17p^2+12}{15p^2+10} > m_5=\frac{17}{15}$ and $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{p,6})=\frac{781p^4+656p^2+315}{720p^4+570p^2+270} > m_6=\frac{781}{720}$.

Therefore the inequality conjectured by Watanabe and Yoshida includes two inequalities: a stronger one

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{p,d}) \tag{1.1}$$

and a weaker one, namely

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq 1+m_d. \tag{1.2}$$

As far as we know, the inequality $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{p,d}) \geq 1+m_d$ is open for $d \geq 7$.

Remark 1.5. Gessel and Monsky have shown (see [16], or Theorem 4.1 in [25]) that

$$\lim_{p\to\infty} \mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{p,d})=1+m_d,$$

for $d \geq 2$.

Watanabe and Yoshida have proved this conjecture in dimension $3, 4$. The cases $d=1,2$ are also known.

In higher dimensions, it was not known until recently whether or not for a fixed dimension d there exists a lower bound, say $C(d) > 1$, such that every local formally unmixed nonregular ring R satisfies $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq C(d)$. We have shown the existence of such lower bound in [2].

Remark 1.6. If R is a complete intersection of dimension $d \geq 1$ and $p > 2$, then Enescu and Shimomoto ([8]) have proved that

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{p,d}).$$

In this paper we will develop techniques which will produce improved estimates for Hilbert-Kunz multiplicities of local rings. In Section 3 we will extend an inequality of Watanabe and Yoshida that gives a lower bound for the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity of a local ring R in terms of a volume function. In Section 4 we will apply this inequality to prove the Watanabe-Yoshida conjecture for rings of Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity at most 5. Section 5 will provide an asymptotic solution to the above mentioned conjecture for rings of dimension 5 and 6. Furthermore, Section 6 will sharpen the lower bound for the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity of a local ring R provided in [2] in all dimensions.

Shortly after this paper was posted to the arXiv (arXiv:1101.5078), O. Celikbas, H. Dao, C. Huneke, and Y. Zhang posted a manuscript that obtains a lower bound of the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity of a d-dimensional ring that improves our bound in certain important cases. Their approach starts with an analysis of radical extensions like in Section 6 of this paper, however it is a different than ours, and uses along the way new inequalities that are very interesting in their own right.

Acknowledgement: The authors are indebted to the anonymous referee for several important suggestions and corrections that improved the manuscript. Notably, the referee observed that Yoshida's results in [27] can be used to improve our Theorem 5.2. Some of the computations in the paper were performed with Wolfram Mathematica [26].

2. Notations, terminology and background

First we would like to review some definitions and results that will be useful later. Throughout the paper R will be a Noetherian ring containing a field of characteristic p, where p is prime. Also, q will denote p^e, a varying power of p.

If I is an ideal in R, then $I^{[q]} = (i^q : i \in I)$, where $q = p^e$ is a power of the characteristic. Let $R^\circ = R \setminus \cup P$, where P runs over the set of all minimal primes of R. An element x is said to belong to the *tight closure* of the ideal I if there exists $c \in R^\circ$ such that $cx^q \in I^{[q]}$ for all sufficiently large $q = p^e$. The tight closure of I is denoted by I^*. By a *parameter ideal* we mean here an ideal generated by a full system of parameters in a local ring R. A tightly closed ideal of R is an ideal I such that $I = I^*$.

Let $F : R \to R$ be the Frobenius homomorphism $F(r) = r^p$. We denote by F^e the eth iteration of F, that is $F^e(r) = r^q$, $F^e : R \to R$. One can regard R as an R-algebra via the homomorphism F^e. Although as an abelian group it equals R, it has a different scalar multiplication. We will denote this new algebra by $R^{(e)}$.

Definition 2.1. R is *F-finite* if $R^{(1)}$ is module finite over R, or, equivalently (in the case that R is reduced), $R^{1/p}$ is module finite over R. R is called *F-pure* if the Frobenius homomorphism is a pure map, i.e, $F \otimes_R M$ is injective for every R-module M.

If R is F-finite, then $R^{1/q}$ is module finite over R, for every q. Moreover, any quotient and localization of an F-finite ring is F-finite. Any finitely generated algebra over a perfect field is F-finite. An F-finite ring is excellent.

Definition 2.2. A reduced Noetherian F-finite ring R is *strongly F-regular* if for every $c \in R^0$ there exists q such that the R-linear map $R \to R^{1/q}$ that sends 1 to $c^{1/q}$ splits over R, or equivalently $Rc^{1/q} \subset R^{1/q}$ splits over R.

The notion of strong F-regularity localizes well, and all ideals are tightly closed in strongly F-regular rings. Regular rings are strongly F-regular and strongly F-regular rings are Cohen-Macaulay and normal.

Let $E_R(K)$ denote the injective hull of the residue field of a local ring $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$.

Definition 2.3. A ring R is called F-rational if all parameter ideals are tightly closed. A ring R is called weakly F-regular if all ideals are tightly closed. The ring R is F-regular if and only if $S^{-1}R$ is weakly F-regular for all multiplicative sets $S \subset R$.

Regular rings are (strongly) F-regular. For Gorenstein rings, the notions of F-rationality and F-regularity coincide (and if in addition the ring is excellent, these coincide with strong F-regularity).

Our work will rely on a number of inequalities that involve the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity obtained in [2] via duality theory, so we will state them here all together.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$ be a local ring of dimension d and characteristic p, where p is prime.*

(i) Assume that R is Cohen-Macaulay of type t. Then

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \frac{\mathrm{e}(R)}{\mathrm{e}(R) - t + 1}.$$

(ii) Assume that R is Gorenstein of embedding dimension $\nu = \mu(\mathfrak{m})$. If R or $\widehat{R}$ is not F-regular then

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \frac{\mathrm{e}(R)}{\mathrm{e}(R) - \nu + d}.$$

(iii) Assume that R is formally unmixed and $d \geq 2$.
If

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) < \frac{\mathrm{e}(R)}{\mathrm{e}(R) - 1},$$

then R is Gorenstein. Also, R and $\widehat{R}$ are F-regular.

(iv) If R is Cohen-Macaulay and has minimal multiplicity, i.e. $\nu = \mathrm{e}(R) + d - 1$, then

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \frac{\mathrm{e}(R)}{2}.$$

Proof. Part (i) is Corollary 3.3 in [2]. Part (ii) is Corollary 3.7 in [2]. Part (iv) is Corollary 3.4 in [2].

For part (iii), by a result of Blickle and Enescu (see for example, Remark 1.3 in [4]), we obtain that R is Cohen-Macaulay. If the type of R is greater than 1 then part (i) above gives a contradiction. So, R is Gorenstein and then part (ii) finishes the proof, as $\nu \geq d + 1$. □

3. VOLUME ESTIMATES FOR HILBERT-KUNZ MULTIPLICITY LOWER BOUNDS

A geometric formula first articulated by Watanabe and Yoshida in [25] gives a great deal of information, especially in small dimension. We will give an improved version of their formula here.

For any real number s, set

$$v_s = \operatorname{vol}\left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in [0,1]^d \,\middle|\, \sum_{i=1}^{d} x_i \le s \right\}$$

Here "vol" denotes the Euclidean volume of a subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. In fact, an explicit formula for v_s, which is due to Pólya and can be traced to Laplace (see formula (16) on page 233 in [7][1]), is

$$v_s = \sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor s \rfloor} (-1)^n \frac{(s-n)^d}{n!(d-n)!}$$

Theorem 3.1 (c.f., [25], Theorem 2.2)**.** *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$ be a formally unmixed local ring of characteristic $p > 0$ and dimension d. Let J be a minimal reduction of $\mathfrak{m}$, and let r be an integer with $r \ge \mu_R(\mathfrak{m}/J^*)$. Let $s \ge 1$ be a rational number. Then*

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \ge \mathrm{e}(R)\left\{ v_s - r v_{s-1} \right\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Theorem 3.1 is an improvement over Watanabe and Yoshida's theorem when the maximum volume occurs for a value of $s > 2$. Theorem 3.1 can be made considerably more general.

Fix an ideal J in an analytically unramified local ring $(R, \mathfrak{m})$. For an element $x \in R$, set $v_J(x) = \sup\{k | x \in J^k\}$. We can then set $f_J(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \dfrac{v_J(x^n)}{n}$. By work of Rees [18], the number $f_J(x)$ is rational, and is the same for any ideal with the same integral closure as J.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$ be a formally unmixed local ring of characteristic $p > 0$ and dimension $d \ge 1$. Let J be a parameter ideal with $e = \mathrm{e}(J)$. Fix $I \supseteq J^*$ and let $r = \mu_R(I/J^*)$. Let $z_1, \dots, z_r$ be minimal generators of I modulo J^*, and let $t_i = f_J(z_i)$. For any rational number $s \ge 0$,*

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(I) \ge e\Big(v_s - \sum_{i=1}^{r} v_{s-t_i}\Big). \tag{3.1}$$

In order to prove Theorem 3.2 we will need Lemma 2.3 of [23] (where, for any non-negative real number α, we define $I^\alpha = I^{\lfloor \alpha \rfloor}$):

Lemma 3.3. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$ be a formally unmixed local ring of characteristic $p > 0$ with $d = \dim R \ge 1$. Let J be a parameter ideal of R. Then for any rational number s with $0 \le s \le d$*

$$\lim_{q\to\infty} \frac{\lambda(R/J^{sq})}{q^d} = \frac{\mathrm{e}(J)s^d}{d!}, \ \ \textit{and} \ \lim_{q\to\infty} \frac{\lambda(R/(J^{sq} + J^{[q]}))}{q^d} = \mathrm{e}(J)v_s.$$

Theorem 3.1 follows from Theorem 3.2 by taking $I = \mathfrak{m}$, J a minimal reduction of $\mathfrak{m}$, and noting that for any minimal generator of $\mathfrak{m}$, the valuation is at least 1.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. We can apply Theorem 8.17 (a) in [12] to remark that $\lambda((B^*)^{[q]}/B^{[q]}) = O(q^{d-1})$.

Let us note that $I = (z_1, \dots, z_r) + J^*$.

---

[1] We thank A. Koldobskiy for providing this reference to us

The proof now follows from an examination of the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda\left(\frac{R}{I^{[q]}}\right) &\geq \lambda\left(\frac{R}{(z_1,\ldots,z_r)^{[q]}+J^{sq}+(J^*)^{[q]}}\right)\\
&= \lambda\left(\frac{R}{(z_1,\ldots,z_r)^{[q]}+J^{[q]}+J^{sq}}\right) - \lambda\left(\frac{I^{[q]}+(J^*)^{[q]}+J^{sq}}{I^{[q]}+J^{[q]}+J^{sq}}\right)\\
&= \lambda\left(\frac{R}{(z_1,\ldots,z_r)^{[q]}+J^{[q]}+J^{sq}}\right) + O(q^{d-1})\\
&\geq \lambda\left(\frac{R}{J^{sq}+J^{[q]}}\right) - \left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-1}\lambda\left(\frac{(z_1,\ldots,z_{i+1})^{[q]}+J^{sq}+J^{[q]}}{(z_1,\ldots,z_i)^{[q]}+J^{sq}+J^{[q]}}\right)\right) + O(q^{d-1})\\
&\geq \lambda\left(\frac{R}{J^{sq}+J^{[q]}}\right) - \left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-1}\lambda\left(\frac{R}{(J^{sq}+J^{[q]}):z_{i+1}^q}\right)\right) + O(q^{d-1})
\end{aligned}$$

For $N = 1, 2, \ldots$, let $\epsilon_N = \frac{1}{p^N}$ and choose $q_0 > p^N$ such that for all $q \geq q_0$ we have

$$\mid \frac{v_J(z_{i+1}^q)}{q} - t_{i+1} \mid < \epsilon_N.$$

Fix N. For $q \geq q_0$ we then have $v_J(z_{i+1}^q) \geq \lceil (t_{i+1}-\epsilon_n)q_i \rceil$ and so $z_{i+1}^q \in J^{\lceil (t_{i+1}-\epsilon_n)q\rceil} = J^{\lceil t_{i+1}q\rceil - \epsilon_n q}$.

It follows that $z_{i+1}^q J^{(s-t_{i+1})q} \subseteq J^{sq-\epsilon_N q}$, and hence $z_{i+1}^q J^{sq} \subseteq J^{(s-\epsilon_N+t_{i+1})q}$.

Therefore,

$$\lambda\left(\frac{R}{(J^{sq}+J^{[q]}):z_i^q}\right) \leq \lambda\left(\frac{R}{(J^{(s-t_{i+1}+\epsilon_N)q}+J^{[q]})}\right).$$

So,

$$\lambda\left(\frac{R}{I^{[q]}}\right) \geq \lambda\left(\frac{R}{J^{sq}+J^{[q]}}\right) - \left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-1}\lambda\left(\frac{R}{(J^{(s-t_{i+1}+\epsilon_N)q}+J^{[q]})}\right)\right) + O(q^{d-1}).$$

Dividing each term in the last inequality obtained by q^d, taking limits as $q \to \infty$, and applying Lemma 3.3 to each term plus the fact that $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} v_{s-\epsilon} = v_s$ yields equation 3.1. ☐

Remark 3.4. This result also extends Fact 2.4 in [25].

4. LOWER BOUNDS FOR RINGS WITH SMALL HILBERT-SAMUEL MULTIPLICITY

In this section we will apply Theorem 3.2 to provide lower bounds for the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity of formally unmixed local ring of Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity less or equal to 5.

We note that

$$1+m_3 = \frac{4}{3}, 1+m_4 = \frac{29}{24}, 1+m_5 = \frac{17}{15}, 1+m_6 = \frac{781}{720} = 1.0847.$$

Theorem 4.1. *Let* $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$ *be a Cohen-Macaulay local ring such that* $\mathrm{e}(R) = 3$ *and* R *is not a complete intersection. Then* $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq 13/8$.

Proof. We may immediately complete. Let $d = \dim R$ and $k = \operatorname{embdim}(R) - \dim(R)$. It is known that $k \leq \mathrm{e} - 1 = 2$. Since R is not a complete intersection then $k > 1$, so R is a ring of minimal multiplicity. Sally's Thereom 1.1 in [19], gives that we can write $R = S/I$ where $S = K[[x_1, \ldots, x_{d+2}]]$. The same result implies that I is a 3-generated ideal of R and that the Hilbert-Burch theorem applies, so I is the ideal of minors of a 3×2 matrix, say $\begin{bmatrix} a_{ij} \end{bmatrix}$, where $a_{ij} \in (x_1, \ldots, x_{d+2})S$.

Consider the ring $R_1 = K[[y_{11}, \ldots, y_{32}, x_1, \ldots, x_{d+2}]]/I_2([y_{ij}])$. Then $\dim R_1 = 4 + d + 2 = d + 6$.

Clearly, $R_1/(y_{ij} - a_{ij} | 1 \leq i \leq 3, 1 \leq j \leq 2) \cong R$. Since $\dim R_1 - \dim R = 6$, the equations form a regular sequence, so $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_1)$, and

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_1) = \mathrm{e}_{HK}\left(K[[y_{11}, \ldots, y_{32}]]/I_2([y_{ij}])\right) = 13/8,$$

(the ring R_1 is isomorphic to the Segree product $S_{2,3}$ and so Theorem 3.3 in [9] gives the value $\frac{13}{8}$). □

Case of a local ring of Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity 3**:** Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a formally unmixed local ring of multiplicity $\mathrm{e} = 3$ and characteristic $p > 2$. We can complete and assume that R is complete and unmixed.

If $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) < \frac{\mathrm{e}}{\mathrm{e}-1} = 1.5$ we have that R is Gorenstein, by Theorem 2.4 (iii). In this case, by Theorem 4.1 if R is not a complete intersection then $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \frac{13}{8}$. Otherwise $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{p,d})$ by Enescu-Shimomoto. This shows that the Watanabe-Yoshida conjecture is settled for local rings of multiplicity 3.

Case of a local ring of Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity 4**:** Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a formally unmixed local ring of multiplicity $\mathrm{e} = 4$ and characteristic $p > 2$. We can complete and assume that R is complete and unmixed. Let $k = \operatorname{embdim}(R) - \dim(R)$.

If $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) < 1 + 1/(4 - 1) = 4/3$, then R is Gorenstein by Theorem 2.4 (iii). Since $k \leq \mathrm{e} - 1 = 3$, then if R has minimal multiplicity ($k = 3$), then $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq 4/2 = 2$ by Theorem 2.4(iv). If $k = 2$, by considering the minimal free resolution of R over S, we see that R is a complete intersection. The case $k = 1$ also leads to R being a complete intersection. In both cases $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{p,d})$ by Enescu-Shimomoto. This shows that the Watanabe-Yoshida conjecture is settled for local rings of multiplicity 4.

Case of a local ring of Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity 5**:** Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a formally unmixed local ring of multiplicity $\mathrm{e} = 5$ and characteristic $p > 2$. We can complete and assume that R is complete and unmixed. Let $d = \dim(R)$.

We can assume that R is Gorenstein if $\mathrm{e}_{HK} < 1.25$ by Theorem 2.4 (iii).

Let us assume that R is Gorenstein and set $k = \operatorname{embdim}(R) - \dim(R)$. If $k = \mathrm{e} - 1$ then R has minimal multiplicity and then Theorem 2.4 (iv) gives $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \mathrm{e}/2 = 2.5$. So we can assume that $k \leq \mathrm{e} - 2 = 3$. In fact, the cases $k = 1, 2$ both imply that R is complete intersection (the case $k = 2$ follows from Serre Theorem as in [21] Theorem 1.2 page 69).

If $k = 3$ then write R as S/I where $S = K[[x_1, \ldots, x_{d+3}]]$ is complete local regular and I is a height 3 Gorenstein ideal with $I \subset \mathfrak{n}^2$ where $\mathfrak{n} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{d+3})$. By the Buchsbaum-Eisenbud Structure Theorem (see Theorem 1.5 page 72 in [21]) the ideal I is given by the set of Pfaffians of a 5×5 anti-symmetric matrix with entries in S. The upper right corner has at most 10 non-zero entries denoted $a_{ij}, 1 \leq i < j \leq 5$. These elements belong to $\mathfrak{n}$.

Let $A = (y_{ij})$ be an antisymmetric matrix of indeterminates of size 5×5 and set

$$R_1 = K[[y_{ij}, x_1, \dots, x_{d+3} : 1 \le i < j \le 5]]/((Pf(A)),$$

where $(Pf(A))$ is the ideal generated by the Pfaffians of A.

We note that $\dim(R_1) = 7 + d + 3 = 10 + d$. Also, the elements $y_{ij} - a_{ij}, 1 \le i < j \le 5$ form a regular sequence in R_1 since $R_1/(y_{ij} - a_{ij}, 1 \le i < j \le 5) \simeq R$, and the dimension drops exactly by 10.

Therefore

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \ge \mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_1) = \mathrm{e}_{HK}(K[[y_{ij} : 1 \le i < j \le 5]]/((Pf(A)),$$

and the former is a Gorenstein ring of dimension 7 and multiplicity 5.

So, it remains to examine 7-dimensional Gorenstein rings of multiplicity 5.

Let J be an ideal generated by an s.o.p.. Since $\mu(\mathfrak{m}) = d + 3$ and $d = \dim(R)$, we get that $3 \ge \mu(\mathfrak{m}/J) \ge \mu(\mathfrak{m}/J^*)$.

Using the notations from Theorem 3.2, we note that $\mathrm{e}(v_s - \mu(\mathfrak{m}/J^*)v_{s-1}) \ge \mathrm{e}(v_s - 3v_{s-1})$.

Now apply Theorem 3.2 with $\mathrm{e} = 5$ and $s = 3.32$ and get $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \ge 1.112$ (we used Mathematica to compute the volume functions).

5. Watanabe-Yoshida Conjecture for rings of dimension 5 and 6

In this section we will show how to use Theorem 3.2 to prove the Watanabe-Yoshida conjecture in dimensions 5 and 6 for large enough p.

We note that

$$m_5 = \frac{17}{15}, \quad m_6 = \frac{781}{720} = 1.0847.$$

We need results of Goto and Nakamura [10], Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$ be a homomorphic image of a Cohen-Macaulay ring. Assume that R is equidimensional.*

Then for every parameter ideal I in R we have

$$\mathrm{e}(I) \ge \lambda(R/I^*).$$

In fact, under the assumption that R is a homomorphic image of a Cohen-Macaulay ring and $\mathrm{Ass}(R) = \mathrm{Assh}(R)$, *if*

$$\mathrm{e}(I) = \lambda(R/I^*),$$

for some parameter ideal I, then R is Cohen-Macaulay and F-rational.

We can prove the following

Theorem 5.2. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$ be a formally unmixed local nonregular ring of dimension d and positive prime characteristic $p > 2$. Then*

(i) If $d = 5$, then

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \ge \mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{p,d}) \ge \frac{17}{15} = 1 + m_5$$

(ii) If $d = 6$, then

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \ge \mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{p,d}) \ge \frac{781}{720} = 1 + m_6.$$

Proof. We can complete R and enlarge the residue field of R so that it is infinite. The associativity formula for the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity shows that for an unmixed ring R $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) < 2$ implies that R is domain (as in Remark 2.6 in [2]). Therefore, we can assume that R is domain.

Let $\underline{x}$ be a minimal reduction for $\mathfrak{m}$. Set $J = (\underline{x})$. Note that we are in the case of R complete and domain. Set $\mathrm{e} = \mathrm{e}(R)$.

We claim that either R has minimal multiplicity or $\mu(m/J^*) \leq \mathrm{e}-2$.

If R is not F-rational then $\mathrm{e}(J) > \lambda(R/J^*)$. So, $\mathrm{e} = \mathrm{e}(J) > 1 + \lambda(\mathfrak{m}/J^*) \geq 1 + \mu(\mathfrak{m}/J^*)$. In other words, $\mathrm{e}-1 > \mu(\mathfrak{m}/J^*)$ or $\mathrm{e}-2 \geq \mu(\mathfrak{m}/J^*)$.

Now let us assume that R is Cohen-Macaulay and F-rational. Then $\mathrm{e} = \mathrm{e}(J) = \lambda(R/J) = \lambda(R/J^*)$. In conclusion, $\lambda(\mathfrak{m}/J^*) = \mathrm{e}-1$. Since $\mu(\mathfrak{m}/J^*) \leq \lambda(\mathfrak{m}/J^*) \leq \mathrm{e}-1$, we see that $\mu(m/J^*) > \mathrm{e}-2$ is only possible when $\mu(\mathfrak{m}/J^*) = \lambda(\mathfrak{m}/J^*)$. Recall that $J^* = J$. So we get $\mu(\mathfrak{m}/J) = \lambda(\mathfrak{m}/J)$. But, $\mu(\mathfrak{m}/J) = \dim(\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2+J) = \lambda(\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2+J)$. Hence $\mu(\mathfrak{m}/J) = \lambda(\mathfrak{m}/J)$ leads to $\mathfrak{m}^2 \subseteq J$. But it is well-known that $\mathfrak{m}^2 \subseteq J$ implies $\mathfrak{m}^2 = \mathfrak{m}J$. This proves that R is of minimal multiplicity by Theorem 3.8 page 45 in [21].

Our claim is now proved. In the minimal multiplicity case the Theorem 2.4 (iii) implies that $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq 1.5 \geq \mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{p,d})$, by Remark 1.4, or $\mathrm{e} = 2$ in which case R is a hypersurface and then $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{p,d})$ by Enescu-Shimomoto.

Hence, in the minimal multiplicity case, the Watanabe-Yoshida conjecture is true.

So we have reduced our analysis to the case $\mu(m/J^*) \leq \mathrm{e}-2$. Let $r = \mu(m/J^*)$.

Theorem 3.2 implies that

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \mathrm{e}\cdot(v_s - rv_{s-1}) \geq \mathrm{e}\cdot(v_s - (\mathrm{e}-2)v_{s-1}).$$

In fact if $\mathrm{e} \geq \mathrm{e}_0$ and $r_0 \geq \mathrm{e}-2$ then also

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \mathrm{e}_0\cdot(v_s - r_0 v_{s-1}) \tag{5.1}$$

Let us consider the case $d = 5$.

Let $\mathrm{e} = \mathrm{e}(R)$. If $\mathrm{e} \geq 137$, then $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \mathrm{e}(R)/d!$ implies that $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq 137/5! = 137/120 = 1.141(6)$.

Let us assume now that $\mathrm{e} \leq 136$. We will apply inequality (3.1) repeatedly by giving values to e_0, r_0, and s.

In the table below we list these choices together with the corresponding lower bound obtained for $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R)$.

e	e_0	r_0	s	e_{HK}
$35 \leq \mathrm{e} \leq 136$	35	134	1.4	≥ 1.153
$18 \leq \mathrm{e} \leq 34$	18	32	1.7	≥ 1.197
$11 \leq \mathrm{e} \leq 17$	11	15	1.9	≥ 1.187
$7 \leq \mathrm{e} \leq 10$	7	8	2.1	≥ 1.161
$5 \leq \mathrm{e} \leq 6$	5	4	2.4	≥ 1.313

Now, let us move to the case $d = 6$.

Again, we may assume that $\mathrm{e} \geq 5$. For $\mathrm{e} \geq 786$ we obtain $\mathrm{e}_{HK} \geq 786/6! = 786/720$.

We will now show that

$$G(e) := \mathrm{e}(v_s - (\mathrm{e}-2)v_{s-1}) \geq \frac{786}{720}$$

for all $5 \leq \mathrm{e} \leq 785$.

Since $G(e) = -v_{s-1}\,\mathrm{e}^2 + (v_2 + 2v_{s-1})e$ is a quadratic function in e, we conclude that for a fixed s, the maximum value of G is attained at $\mathrm{e} = m := \frac{v_s+2v_{s-1}}{2v_{s-1}}$.

This implies that for $a \leq m \leq b$

$$G(e) \leq \min(G(a), G(b)) \tag{5.2}$$

The formula for v_s gives the following: $v_s = \frac{s^6}{6!}$, for $0 \leq s < 1$; $v_s = \frac{s^6}{6!} - \frac{(s-1)^6}{5!}$, for $1 \leq s < 2$ and $v_s = \frac{s^6}{6!} - \frac{(s-1)^6}{5!} - \frac{(s-2)^6}{2\cdot 4!}$, for $2 \leq s < 3$.

For $1 \leq s < 2$, we obtain $m = \dfrac{s^6 - 4(s-1)^6}{2(s-1)^6}$. For $2 \leq s < 3$, we obtain $m = \dfrac{s^6 - 4(s-1)^6 + 3(s-2)^6}{2(s-1)^6 - 6(s-2)^6}$.

If $296 \leq \mathrm{e} \leq 786$, then by letting $s = 1.3$ we obtain $m \geq 3308.57 > 786$. This gives that G is increasing on $[286, 786]$ which shows that on this interval $G(e) \geq G(296) > 1.89$ and so $\mathrm{e}_{HK} \geq 1.89$.

For the rest of the analysis, as in the paragraph above, we will consider intervals $[a, b]$ containing e, give a specific value to s and then compute the resulting value for m. In each case, m will happen to land in $[a, b]$ and hence inequality 5.2 will apply.

The numbers including those for specific values for G are computed using Mathematica and we usually present our numbers while keeping the first decimal point only.

$[a, b]$	s	m	$\min(G(a), G(b))$	$\mathrm{e}_{HK} \geq$
$[59, 296]$	1.6	177.7	$G(59)$	1.133
$[26, 58]$	1.9	42.2	$G(26)$	1.123
$16, 25]$	2.1	22.2	$G(16)$	1.118
$[10, 25]$	2.2	13.3	$G(10)$	1.118
$[5, 9]$	2.6	7.3	$G(5)$	1.107

□

6. ROOT EXTENSIONS AND COMPARISON OF HILBERT-KUNZ MULTIPLICITIES

The next theorem we prove allows us to use Theorem 3.2 to obtain lower bounds for Hilbert-Kunz multiplicities that are not available using Theorem 3.1.

We will need to use a result of Watanabe and Yoshida ([23], Theorem 2.7). Let $ff(A)$ denote the total ring of fractions of a ring A.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}) \hookrightarrow (S, \mathfrak{n})$ be a module-finite extension of local domains. Then for every $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal I of R, we have*

$$e_{HK}(I) = \frac{e_{HK}(IS)}{[ff(S) : ff(R)]} \cdot [S/\mathfrak{n} : R/\mathfrak{m}]. \tag{6.1}$$

Definition 6.2. Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a domain. Let $z \in \mathfrak{m}$ and n a positive integer. Let $v \in R^+$ be any root of $f(X) = X^n - z$. We call $S = R[v]$ a *radical extension* for the pair R, z.

It should be remarked that whenever S is radical for R, z, then $b := [ff(S) : ff(R)] \leq n$. In what follows $\mathfrak{n}$ will denote the maximal ideal of S.

Lemma 6.3. *Let* $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$ *be a domain and* $(S = R[v], \mathfrak{n})$ *a radical extension for* R *and* $z \in R$. *Assume that* K *is algebraically closed. Let* $I \subseteq R$ *be such that* $z \notin I$ *and* $\mathfrak{m} = (z) + I$. *Suppose that* $J = (zr) + I_0 \subseteq R$ *is an ideal such that* $\lambda_R(J/I_0) = 1$ *and in* S, $vrIS \subseteq I_0 S$ *(one such possibility is* $J = \mathfrak{m} = (z) + I$*). Let* $b = [ff(S) : ff(R)]$.

Then

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(I_0, J) \leq \frac{n}{n-1}\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) - \frac{n}{b(n-1)}\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(S).$$

Proof. Consider the following sequence of inclusions:

$$\mathfrak{m}S \subset (\mathfrak{m}, v^{n-1})S \subset \cdots \subset (\mathfrak{m}, v^2)S \subset (\mathfrak{m}, v)S = \mathfrak{n}.$$

It is easy to see that

$$(\mathfrak{m}, v^j)^{[q]}S : v^{q(j-1)} \subset (\mathfrak{m}, v^{j+1})^{[q]}S : v^{qj},$$

since, if $cv^{q(j-1)} \in (\mathfrak{m}, v^j)^{[q]}S$, then $cv^{qj} \in (\mathfrak{m}, v^j)^{[q]}v^q S \subset (\mathfrak{m}, v^{j+1})^{[q]}S$.

Thus $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(\mathfrak{m}S, \mathfrak{n}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathrm{e}_{HK}((\mathfrak{m}, v^{j+1})S, (\mathfrak{m}, v^j)S) \geq (n-1)\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(\mathfrak{m}S, (\mathfrak{m}, v^{n-1})S)$.

Consider now the filtration

$$I_0 S \subseteq (I_0, zrv^{n-1})S \subseteq \cdots \subseteq (I_0, zrv)S \subseteq (I_0, zr)S = JS.$$

Let $s \in (\mathfrak{m}^{[q]}S :_S v^{(n-1)q}) = (v^n, I)^{[q]}S : v^{(n-1)q} = v^q S + I^{[q]}S :_S v^{(n-1)q}$. Then for any $0 \leq j < n$,

$$\begin{aligned} s(zrv^j)^q \in (v^q S + I^{[q]}S :_S v^{(n-1)q})(zrv^j)^q &\subseteq (zrv^{(j+1)})^q S + (I^{[q]}S :_S v^{(n-1)q})(v^{(n-1)q}r^q v^{(j+1)q}) \\ &\subseteq (zrv^{(j+1)})^q)S + I^{[q]}r^q v^{(j+1)q}S \subseteq (zrv^{(j+1)}, I_0)^{[q]}S. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\mathrm{e}_{HK}((I_0, zrv^{j+1})S, (I_0, zrv^j)S) \leq \mathrm{e}_{HK}(\mathfrak{m}S, (\mathfrak{m}, v^{n-1})S)$.

Since in the chain we have at most n inclusions we get, using Theorem 6.1 that $b\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(I_0, J) = \mathrm{e}_{HK}(I_0 S, (I_0, zr)S) \leq n\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(\mathfrak{m}S, (\mathfrak{m}, v^{n-1})S) \leq \frac{n}{n-1}\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(\mathfrak{m}S, \mathfrak{n}) = \frac{n}{n-1}(b\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) - \mathrm{e}_{HK}(S))$, which gives

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(I_0, J) \leq \frac{n}{n-1}\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) - \frac{n}{b(n-1)}\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(S).$$

□

In what follows we consider a Gorenstein local domain $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$ with algebraically closed residue field. Let us fix some notation. Let $d = \dim(R)$ and consider a system of parameters $\underline{x} = x_1, \cdots, x_d$ that generates a minimal reduction of $\mathfrak{m}$. Also, $k = \operatorname{embdim}(R) - \dim(R)$. We plan to provide a lower bound greater than 1 for the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity of R. We also assume that $p \neq 2$. Note that if $k = 2$ and R is Gorenstein, then R is a complete intersection. This is because, after completing, R is the quotient of a regular ring of dimension $d + 2$ and has projective dimension 2 over the regular ring. The only possible resolution in this case is of a regular sequence over the regular ring.

The main result in [8] gives the conjectured lower bound for $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R)$ if R is a complete intersection. So, we will assume that R is not a complete intersection, hence $k \geq 3$. Moreover, by a result of J. Sally (Corollary 3.2 in [20]), no Gorenstein rings except hypersurfaces can have minimal multiplicity (i.e., $\mathrm{e}(R) = \mu(\mathfrak{m}) - d + 1$) so $\mathrm{e} = \mathrm{e}(R) \geq k + 2$. In particular, $\mathrm{e} \geq 5$.

Lemma 6.4. *Let* $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$ *be a local Gorenstein ring,* $k = \operatorname{embdim}(R) - \dim(R)$ *and* $\mathrm{e} = \mathrm{e}(R)$*. Let* $\underline{x} = x_1, \ldots, x_d$ *be a system of parameters for* R*.*

i) The $R/(\underline{x})$*-module* $\dfrac{(\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}^2}{(\underline{x})}$ *is* k*-generated with one dimensional socle.*

ii) Assume that $\underline{x}$ *is a minimal reduction for* $\mathfrak{m}$*. Then* $k = \mathrm{e} - 2$ *if and only if* $(\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}^2 = \mathfrak{m}$*.*

Proof. For i), note that $R/(\underline{x})$ is Gorenstein and hence we can use Matlis duality. The module $\dfrac{(\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}^2}{(\underline{x})}$ is Matlis dual to $\dfrac{R}{(\underline{x}) + \mathfrak{m}^2}$. $\dfrac{R}{(\underline{x}) + \mathfrak{m}^2}$ is cyclic with k dimensional socle, therefore $\dfrac{(\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}^2}{(\underline{x})}$ is k-generated with one dimensional socle.

To prove part (ii), we recall Proposition 4.2 in [20] which says in our case that $k = \mathrm{e} - 2$ if and only if $\mathfrak{m}^3 \subset (\underline{x}) \cdot \mathfrak{m}$ and $\lambda(\mathfrak{m}^2/(\underline{x}) \cdot \mathfrak{m}) = 1$. Hence one direction of (ii) follows at once. Now assume that $\mathfrak{m}^3 \subset (\underline{x})$. Note that

$$(\underline{x}) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}(\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2) + (\underline{x}) \subseteq (\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m} \subset (\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2),$$

and since R is Gorenstein we must have $\mathfrak{m}(\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2) + (\underline{x}) = (\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}$.

Therefore $\mathfrak{m} \cdot \dfrac{(\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}^2}{(\underline{x})} = \dfrac{(\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}}{(\underline{x})}$, and this shows that

$$k = \mu\Big(\frac{(\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}^2}{(\underline{x})}\Big) = \dim_K\Big(\frac{(\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}^2}{(\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}}\Big) = \dim_K\Big(\frac{\mathfrak{m}}{(\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}}\Big) = \lambda\Big(\frac{\mathfrak{m}}{(\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}}\Big) = \mathrm{e} - 2,$$

because $\lambda(R/\underline{x}) = \mathrm{e}$ ($\underline{x}$ forms a minimal reduction for $\mathfrak{m}$.)

□

Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$ be a local ring with infinite residue field and of dimension d. According to a result due to Northcott and Rees and, independently, Trung (see Theorem 8.6.6 in [22]) there exists a Zariski open subset U of $(\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2)^d$ such that any $x_1, \ldots, x_d$ with $(x_1 + \mathfrak{m}^2, \ldots, x_d + \mathfrak{m}^2) \in U$ form a minimal reduction for $\mathfrak{m}$. We will call a set U with this property *reduction open.*

Lemma 6.5. *Let* $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$ *be a local Gorenstein ring containing an infinite field of positive prime characteristic* $p > 2$*. Assume that* $k = \operatorname{embdim}(R) - \dim(R) \geq 2$*. Let* U *be a reduction open subset of* $(\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2)^d$*. Let* $\underline{x}$ *be in* $\mathfrak{m}$ *such that* $(x_1 + \mathfrak{m}^2, \ldots, x_d + \mathfrak{m}^2) \in U$

Then, we may pick minimal generators $z_1, \ldots, z_k$ *for* $\dfrac{(\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}^2}{(\underline{x})}$ *and a minimal generator* z *of* $\mathfrak{m}$ *such that* $zz_i \notin (\underline{x})$ *for* $1 \leq i \leq k$ *and* $z, x_2, \ldots, x_d$ *form a minimal reduction of* $\mathfrak{m}$*.*

If $k \neq \mathrm{e} - 2$*, then* z *can be picked not in* $(\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}^2$*. If* $k = \mathrm{e} - 2$*, one may take* $z = z_1$*.*

Proof. Clearly

$$(\underline{x}) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}(\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2) + (\underline{x}) \subseteq (\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m} \subset (\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2),$$

and since R is Gorenstein we must have $\mathfrak{m}(\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2) + (\underline{x}) = (\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}$. This is the case because $(\underline{x}) = \mathfrak{m}(\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2) + (\underline{x})$ gives $\mathfrak{m}(\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2) \subseteq (\underline{x})$ or $(\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2) = (\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}$ which contradicts the fact that $k \geq 2$.

Choose $z_1, \ldots, z_k$ in R such that their images form a minimal set of generators for $\dfrac{(\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}^2}{(\underline{x})}$. We conclude that each $z_i \notin \mathfrak{m}(\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2) + (\underline{x})$, and so $z_i \notin (\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Note that $z_i \in (\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}^2$ and hence $\mathfrak{m}^2 \subset (\underline{x}) : z_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

Let $U_1 = \{z+\mathfrak{m}^2 \in \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 : (z+\mathfrak{m}^2, x_2+\mathfrak{m}^2, \ldots, x_d+\mathfrak{m}^2) \in U\}$. Then U_1 is a Zariski open subset of $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$. In what follows, for $a \in R$, $\overline{a}$ will denote the class of the element $a \in R$ modulo $\mathfrak{m}^2$, $\hat{a}$ the class of a in $R/\mathfrak{m}$ and $\tilde{a}$ the class of a in $R/(\underline{x})$.

Then

$$U_1 \not\subseteq \cup_i((\underline{x}) : z_i)/\mathfrak{m}^2,$$

since otherwise there exists i such that $U_1 \subseteq ((\underline{x}) : z_i)/\mathfrak{m}^2$ which gives $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq ((\underline{x}) : z_i)$ or $z_i \in (\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}$ which is not the case (over an infinite field, a dense Zariski open subset cannot be covered by a finite union of proper vector subspaces due to dimension reasons.)

Note that $(\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2) + \mathfrak{m}^2 = \mathfrak{m}$ implies by NAK that $(\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2) = \mathfrak{m}$. So, a similar argument shows that when $\mathfrak{m} \neq (\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2)$ one has that

$$U_1 \not\subseteq \cup_i((\underline{x}) : z_i)/\mathfrak{m}^2 \cup ((\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2) + \mathfrak{m}^2)/\mathfrak{m}^2.$$

This guarantees that, in either case, one can pick z a minimal generator of $\mathfrak{m}$ such that $zz_i \notin (\underline{x})$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and that $z \notin (\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}^2$, whenever $\mathfrak{m} \neq (\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2)$.

Let us note that $k = \mathrm{e} - 2$ is equivalent to $(\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2) = \mathfrak{m}$ by Lemma 6.4.

Whenever $(\underline{x} : \mathfrak{m}^2) = \mathfrak{m}$, we know that no z_i can kill all z_j modulo $\underline{x}$. So for all i, j, there exists $r_{ij} \in R$ such that $\tilde{z}_i\tilde{z}_j = r_{ij}\tilde{u}$, where u gives the socle generator of $R/(\underline{x})$. Here, each r_{ij} is an element in R, and for each i there exists j such that $\hat{r}_{ij}$ in $R/\mathfrak{m}$ is nonzero. After renumbering, we can assume that $\hat{r}_{12} \neq 0$. Since R contains an infinite field we have that K is infinite as well. Let $z_1' = z_1 + yz_2$ where $y \in R$. Let C be the set $\{\overline{z_1} + \overline{y} \cdot \overline{z_2}, y \in R\}$ in $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$. This is a line in the $(k+d)$-dimensional space $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$.

Let $z_j' = z_j + yz_1' = z_j + yz_1 + y^2z_2$ for all $j \geq 2$.

We will find $y \in R$ such that ${z_1'}^2 \notin (\underline{x})$ and for all $j \geq 2$, $z_1'z_j' \notin (\underline{x})$, and $\overline{z_1'} \in U_1$.

Computing $\tilde{z_1'}^2 = (\hat{r}_{11}^2 + 2\hat{r}_{12}\hat{y} + \hat{r}_{22}\hat{y}^2)\tilde{u}$ and $\tilde{z_1'}\tilde{z}_j = [\hat{r}_{1j} + (\hat{r}_{2j} + \hat{r}_{11})\hat{y} + 2\hat{r}_{12}\hat{y}^2 + \hat{r}_{22}\hat{y}^3]\tilde{u}$, $j = 2, \ldots, k$ gives k polynomial functions in $\hat{y} \in K$. Each polynomial is not identically zero because $2\hat{r}_{12} \neq 0$. Let $U = \{\hat{y} \in R/\mathfrak{m} = K : \tilde{z_1'}^2 \neq 0, \tilde{z_1'}\tilde{z_j'} \neq 0, \forall j = 2, \ldots, k\}$. This is an open nonempty subset of K. For any choice of $y \in R$ such that $\hat{y} \in U$ we have that ${z_1'}^2 \notin (\underline{x})$ and for all $j \geq 2$, $z_1'z_j' \notin (\underline{x})$.

Note that $C \cap U_1$ is an open subset in C. Since C is isomorphic to K we have a open subset of K, say U', such that for all $y \in R$ such that $\hat{y} \in U'$, $\overline{z}_1 + \overline{y} \cdot \overline{z}_2$ belongs to U_1. Now, since K is infinite U' and U must intersect so we can choose $y \in R$ such that $\hat{y} \in U \cap U'$.

To finish the argument here, it is enough to note that we can swap now z_1 for z_1' and z_j' for z_j corresponding to our choice for y, and the conditions are now satisfied.

□

From now on, let us fix $z_1, \ldots, z_k \in R$ chosen as in Lemma 6.5.

Thus, modulo $(\underline{x})$, each zz_i, $i = 1, \cdots, k$ generates the socle of $R/(\underline{x})$.

Let us denote $J_i = (z_i, \cdots, z_k, \underline{x})$, for all $i = 1, \cdots, k$.

Let u in R be an element that generates the socle of $R/(\underline{x})$. Denote $J = (\underline{x}, u)$. Note that according to our remark on the elements zz_i, $J = (I, zz_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

Denote $L_i = (\underline{x}, z_i)$ and $B_i = (\underline{x}) : L_i$. Note that $L_k = J_k$. Since $z_i \in (\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}^2 - (\underline{x}) : \mathfrak{m}$, the chain $(\underline{x}, z_i) \supsetneq (\underline{x}, u) \supsetneq (\underline{x})$ is saturated, i.e., $\lambda(L_i/(\underline{x})) = 2$. So by duality, $\lambda(R/B_i) = 2$. Since $zz_i \notin (\underline{x})$, the chain $R \supsetneq (z, B_i) = \mathfrak{m} \supsetneq B_i$ is saturated.

For any $q = p^e$, let $G_q = (\underline{x}^{[q]} : \mathfrak{m}^{[q]})$. Note that $J^{[q]} \subset G_q$.

Consider a radical extension for R and z, $S = R[v]$ such that $v^n = z$. Since R is Henselian and $z \in \mathfrak{m}$, S is local. Set $b = [\mathrm{ff}(S) : \mathrm{ff}(R)](\leq n)$. Denote $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) = 1+\epsilon_R$, $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(S) = 1+\epsilon_S$.

In what follows we will make a sequence of claims that will lead to our main result.

Claim (1): $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(B_i, \mathfrak{m}) \leq \frac{n}{n-1}\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) - \frac{1}{b(n-1)}\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(S)$.

From our observations above about R/B_i we can apply Lemma 6.3 with $I = B_i$ and $J = \mathfrak{m}$ to get $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(B_i, \mathfrak{m}) \leq \frac{n}{n-1}\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) - \frac{n}{b(n-1)}\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(S)$.

Claim (2):

$$\lim_{q\to\infty} \frac{1}{q^d}\,\lambda(G_q/J^{[q]}) = \mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) - \mathrm{e}_{HK}((\underline{x}), J).$$

We observe that $R/(\underline{x})^{[q]}$ is Gorenstein Artinian.

So, by duality, $\lambda\left(\frac{R}{(\underline{x})^{[q]}}\right) = \lambda\left(\mathrm{Hom}_R\left(\frac{R}{L^{[q]}}, \frac{R}{(\underline{x})^{[q]}}\right)\right) = \lambda\left(\frac{(\underline{x})^{[q]} : L^{[q]}}{(\underline{x})^{[q]}}\right)$, for any $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal L in R.

Let $L = \mathfrak{m}$ and we obtain $\lambda(G_q/(\underline{x})^{[q]}) = \lambda(R/\mathfrak{m}^{[q]})$, so $\lambda(R/G_q) = \lambda(R/(\underline{x})^{[q]}) - \lambda(R/\mathfrak{m}^{[q]})$, which is the same as

$$\lambda(G_q/J^{[q]}) = \lambda(R/\mathfrak{m}^{[q]}) - \left(\lambda(R/(\underline{x})^{[q]}) - \lambda(R/J^{[q]})\right).$$

Dividing by q^d, and taking the limit as $q \to \infty$ gives the claim.

Claim (3):

$$\lambda(G_q/J^{[q]}) \geq \lambda\Big(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^k (L_i^{[q]} \cap G_q)}{J^{[q]}}\Big)$$

This is immediate since $\sum_{i=1}^k (L_i^{[q]} \cap G_q) \subset G_q$.

Now, we need to introduce further notation:

for $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$, we let

$$N_{i,q} = \frac{L_i^{[q]} \cap G_q}{J^{[q]}},$$

and put

$$a_i := \mathrm{limsup}\frac{1}{q^d}\,\lambda\Big(\frac{(L_i^{[q]} \cap G_q) \cap \sum_{j=i+1}^k (L_j^{[q]} \cap G_q)}{J^{[q]}}\Big),$$

so

$$a_i = \mathrm{limsup}\frac{1}{q^d}\,\lambda(N_{i,q} \cap \sum_{j=i+1}^k N_{j,q}).$$

We set $a_k = 0$.

Claim (4): For any $i_0 \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$

$$\lambda(\sum_{i=i_0}^k N_{i,q}) = \sum_{i=i_0}^k \lambda(N_{i,q}) - \sum_{i=i_0}^{k-1} \lambda(N_{i,q} \cap \sum_{j=i+1}^k N_{j,q}).$$

Write the following exact sequence

$$0 \to N_{i,q} \cap \sum_{j=i+1}^{k} N_{j,q} \to N_{i,q} \oplus \sum_{j=i+1}^{k} N_{j,q} \to \sum_{j=i}^{k} N_{j,q} \to 0$$

and now start with $i = i_0$ and recursively one gets the claim.

Claim (5):

$$\lambda(N_{i,q}) \geq \lambda(\frac{L_i^{[q]}}{J^{[q]}}) - \lambda(\frac{\mathfrak{m}^{[q]}}{B_i^{[q]}}).$$

From the short exact sequence

$$0 \to N_{i,q} \to \frac{L_i^{[q]}}{J^{[q]}} \to \frac{L_i^{[q]}}{L_i^{[q]} \cap G_q} \to 0$$

we see that $\lambda(\frac{L_i^{[q]}}{J^{[q]}}) = \lambda(N_{i,q}) + \lambda(\frac{L_i^{[q]}}{L_i^{[q]} \cap G_q})$.
But

$$\lambda(\frac{L_i^{[q]}}{L_i^{[q]} \cap G_q}) = \lambda(\frac{L_i^{[q]} + G_q}{G_q}) \leq \lambda(\frac{(\underline{x})^{[q]} : B_i^{[q]}}{G_q}) = \lambda(\frac{\mathfrak{m}^{[q]}}{B_i^{[q]}}).$$

.

Hence

$$\lambda(N_{i,q}) = \lambda(\frac{L_i^{[q]}}{J^{[q]}}) - \lambda(\frac{L_i^{[q]}}{L_i^{[q]} \cap G_q}) \geq \lambda(\frac{L_i^{[q]}}{J^{[q]}}) - \lambda(\frac{\mathfrak{m}^{[q]}}{B_i^{[q]}}).$$

Claim (6):

$$\lambda(\frac{L_i^{[q]}}{J^{[q]}}) = \lambda(\frac{J_i^{[q]}}{J_{i+1}^{[q]}}) + \lambda(\frac{L_i^{[q]} \cap J_{i+1}^{[q]}}{J^{[q]}}).$$

For all $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$,
$L_i^{[q]} + J_{i+1}^{[q]} = J_i^{[q]}$, so

$$\frac{L_i^{[q]}}{J^{[q]}} / \frac{L_i^{[q]} \cap J_{i+1}^{[q]}}{J^{[q]}} \simeq \frac{J_i^{[q]}}{J_{i+1}^{[q]}}$$

and this gives the claim.

Claim (7):

$$\lambda(\frac{L_i^{[q]} \cap G_q \cap (\sum_{j=i+1}^{k} L_j^{[q]} \cap G_q)}{J^{[q]}}) \leq \lambda(\frac{L_i^{[q]} \cap J_{i+1}^{[q]}}{J^{[q]}}).$$

This follows immediately as $L_i^{[q]} \cap G_q \cap (\sum_{j=i+1}^{k} L_j^{[q]} \cap G_q) \subset L_i^{[q]} \cap J_{i+1}^{[q]}$, since $L_j \subseteq J_{i+1}$ for all $j \geq i+1$.

Theorem 6.6. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a local Gorenstein ring. Let $\underline{x}$ be a minimal reduction generated by a system of parameters and let $z \in \mathfrak{m} \setminus (\underline{x})$ be a minimal generator of $\mathfrak{m}$ picked as described above.*

Let $S = R[v]$ be a radical extension for R and z of degree n. Let $b = [ff(S) : ff(R)]$. Then

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \begin{cases} \dfrac{\mathrm{e}(n-1)}{\mathrm{e}\, n-2} + \dfrac{n(\mathrm{e}-2)}{b(\mathrm{e}\, n-2)}\, \mathrm{e}_{HK}(S) & \text{if } k = \mathrm{e}-2; \\ \dfrac{\mathrm{e}(n-1)}{(n-1)\,\mathrm{e}+k+1} + \dfrac{n(k+1)}{b\big((n-1)\,\mathrm{e}+k+1\big)}\, \mathrm{e}_{HK}(S) & \text{if } k < \mathrm{e}-2. \end{cases}$$

For $n = b = 2$, the first case gives $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \dfrac{\mathrm{e}}{2(\mathrm{e}-1)} + \dfrac{\mathrm{e}-2}{2(\mathrm{e}-1)}\, \mathrm{e}_{HK}(S)$ and the second case gives $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \dfrac{\mathrm{e}}{\mathrm{e}+k+1} + \dfrac{k+1}{\mathrm{e}+k+1}\, \mathrm{e}_{HK}(S)$.

Proof. We will keep the notation introduced above and make references to the claims just proved.

We see that $\lambda(\frac{G_q}{J^{[q]}}) \geq \lambda(\sum_{j=1}^{k} N_{j,q})$ and by Claim (4) and (5) we get

$$\lambda\left(\frac{G_q}{J^{[q]}}\right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda(N_{i,q}) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \lambda(N_{i,q} \cap \sum_{j=i+1}^{k} N_{j,q})$$
$$\geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left(\lambda\left(\frac{L_i^{[q]}}{J^{[q]}}\right) - \lambda\left(\frac{\mathfrak{m}^{[q]}}{B_i^{[q]}}\right)\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \lambda(N_{i,q} \cap \sum_{j=i+1}^{k} N_{j,q}),$$

which by Claim (7) leads to
$\lambda\left(\frac{G_q}{J^{[q]}}\right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda\left(\frac{L_i^{[q]}}{J^{[q]}}\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \lambda\left(\frac{L_i^{[q]} \cap J_{i+1}^{[q]}}{J^{[q]}}\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda\left(\frac{\mathfrak{m}^{[q]}}{B_i^{[q]}}\right)$
and now using Claim (6) this last term can be bounded below by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \lambda\left(\frac{J_i^{[q]}}{J_{i+1}^{[q]}}\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda\left(\frac{\mathfrak{m}^{[q]}}{B_i^{[q]}}\right) + \lambda\left(\frac{L_k^{[q]}}{J^{[q]}}\right).$$

But $L_k = J_k$, so we get

$$\lambda\left(\frac{G_q}{J^{[q]}}\right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \lambda\left(\frac{J_i^{[q]}}{J_{i+1}^{[q]}}\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda\left(\frac{\mathfrak{m}^{[q]}}{B_i^{[q]}}\right) + \lambda\left(\frac{J_k^{[q]}}{J^{[q]}}\right).$$

Dividing by q^d and taking the limits leads to

$$\frac{1}{q^d} \lim_{q\to\infty} \lambda\left(\frac{G_q}{J^{[q]}}\right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_{i+1}, J_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathrm{e}_{HK}(B_i, \mathfrak{m}) + \mathrm{e}_{HK}(J, J_k).$$

Consider the filtration

$$(\underline{x}) \subseteq J \subseteq J_k \subseteq \cdots \subseteq J_2 \subseteq J_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{m}.$$

So, $\mathrm{e}_{HK}((\underline{x})) - \mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) = \mathrm{e}_{HK}((\underline{x}), J) + \mathrm{e}_{HK}(J, J_k) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_{i+1}, J_i) + \mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_1, \mathfrak{m})$.

We have that $\mathrm{e}_{HK}((\underline{x})) = \mathrm{e}$ and $\lim_{q\to\infty} \frac{1}{q^d} \lambda(G_q/J^{[q]}) = \mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) - \mathrm{e}_{HK}((\underline{x}), J)$ as shown in Claim (2), So, $\mathrm{e}-2\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R)+\lim_{q\to\infty}\frac{1}{q^d}\lambda(G_q/J^{[q]}) = \mathrm{e}-2\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R)+\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R)-\mathrm{e}_{HK}((\underline{x}),J) = \mathrm{e}_{HK}(J,J_k)+\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_{i+1},J_i)+\mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_1,\mathfrak{m})$.

But,

$$\frac{1}{q^d}\lim_{q\to\infty}\lambda(\frac{G_q}{J^{[q]}}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_{i+1},J_i)-\sum_{i=1}^{k}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(B_i,\mathfrak{m})+\mathrm{e}_{HK}(J,J_k),$$

which says that

$\mathrm{e}-2\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R)+\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_{i+1},J_i)-\sum_{i=1}^{k}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(B_i,\mathfrak{m})+\mathrm{e}_{HK}(J,J_k) \leq \mathrm{e}_{HK}(J,J_k)+\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_{i+1},J_i)+\mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_1,\mathfrak{m})$.

By cancelling out the common terms, we see that

$\mathrm{e}\leq\sum_{i=1}^{k}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(B_i,\mathfrak{m})+\mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_1,\mathfrak{m})+2\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R)$.

But $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_1,\mathfrak{m})=\mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_1)-\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R)$.

We have also proved earlier that $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(B_i,\mathfrak{m})\leq\frac{n}{n-1}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R)-\frac{n}{b(n-1)}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(S)$.

So,

$$\mathrm{e}\leq k(\frac{n}{n-1}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R)-\frac{n}{b(n-1)}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(S))+\mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_1)+\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R),$$

which can be rearranged as

$$\mathrm{e}\leq k(\frac{n}{n-1}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R)-\frac{n}{b(n-1)}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(S))+\mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_1,\mathfrak{m})+2\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R).$$

If $k=\mathrm{e}-2$, then $J_1=\mathfrak{m}$, so $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_1,\mathfrak{m})=0$. A small amount of algebra gives the desired conclusion.

Assume that $k<\mathrm{e}-2$. Then according to the set up for this case, we have that $J_1\subsetneq\mathfrak{m}$, $z\notin J_1$, and z is a part of a minimal generating set for $\mathfrak{m}$. Call this generating set $z,y_2,\ldots,y_h$ with $h=k+d$. Then $\mathfrak{m}=(z,y_2,\ldots,y_h)+\mathfrak{m}^2$.

So we may pick an ideal $J_0=(y_2,\ldots,y_h)+\mathfrak{m}^2$ such that $J_1\subseteq J_0\subseteq J_0+(z)=\mathfrak{m}$, where $\lambda(\mathfrak{m}/J_0)=1$. By Lemma 6.3, $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_0,\mathfrak{m})\leq\dfrac{n}{n-1}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R)-\dfrac{n}{b(n-1)}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(S)$. Also, $\lambda(J_0/J_1)=\mathrm{e}-k-3$, so $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(J_1,J_0)\leq(\mathrm{e}-k-3)\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R)$. Putting this information into our inequality now yields

$$\mathrm{e}\leq(k+1)(\frac{n}{n-1}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R)-\frac{n}{b(n-1)}\mathrm{e}_{HK}(S))+(e-k-1)\,\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R),$$

and some algebra yields our other case. □

Lower bounds for the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity of a Gorenstein F-regular ring: We now begin a construction that will yield a lower bound for Gorenstein, F-regular, non-regular local rings. So assume that $(R,\mathfrak{m})$ is an F-regular local ring of multiplicity $\mathrm{e}=\mathrm{e}(R)>1$ and characteristic $p>2$. By the results in Section 4 we may actually assume that $\mathrm{e}\geq 6$. Note that R must be a normal domain. We may complete and extend the residue field to assume that it is algebraically closed. Let $d=\dim R$ and $k=\mu(\mathfrak{m})-d$. Let $\mathbf{x}=x_1,\ldots,x_d$ be a minimal reduction of $\mathfrak{m}$, so that $\lambda(R/(\mathbf{x}))=\mathrm{e}$. We now inductively choose $w_1,\ldots,w_d\in\mathfrak{m}$ such that for each $i=1,\ldots,d$, the set $w_1,\ldots,w_i,x_{i+1},\ldots,x_d$ is a minimal reduction for $\mathfrak{m}$, there is a set A_i of minimal generators of $(w_1,\ldots,w_i,x_{i+1},\ldots,x_d):\mathfrak{m}^2$ (modulo $(w_1,\ldots,w_i,x_{i+1},\ldots,x_d)$) such that $w_{i+1}z\notin(w_1,\ldots,w_i,x_{i+1},\ldots,x_d)$ for $z\in A_i$, if $k<\mathrm{e}-2$, $w_{i+1}\notin(w_1,\ldots,w_i,x_{i+1},\ldots,x_d):\mathfrak{m}^2$, and if $k=\mathrm{e}-2$, w_{i+1} belongs to A_i. Such a choice is due to our Lemma 6.5.

For convenience we let $\mathbf{w}_i = w_1, \dots, w_i$ and $\mathbf{x}_{i+1} = x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d$.

Now, fix n, and let $v_i = w_i^{1/n}$ be an nth root in R^+ for $1 \le i \le n$. As above, let $\mathbf{v}_i = v_1, \dots, v_i$. Set $R_0 = R$ and for $i \ge 1$, $R_i = R[v_1, \dots, v_i] = R_{i-1}[v_i]$. Each ring is henselian, so adjoining v_i yields another local ring. Moreover, all the residue fields are the same. If we assume that R_i is normal (e.g., if R_i is F-regular), then $R_{i+1} \cong R_i[X]/(X^n - w_{i+1})$, so R_{i+1} is free of rank n over R_i (since R_i is normal, the minimal polynomial of v_{i+1} over $\mathrm{ff}(R_i)$ has coefficients in R_i, hence divides $X^n - w_{i+1}$. If it properly divides, then an interpretation of the product of the constant terms involved will give $w_{i+1} \in (\mathbf{w}_i) + \mathfrak{m}^2 \subseteq R$, meaning w_{i+1} is not a minimal generator of $\mathfrak{m}$). Thus, in the context of Theorem 6.6, applied to $R_i \to R_{i+1}$, we have $n = b = [\mathrm{ff}(R_{i+1}), \mathrm{ff}(R_i)]$.

Let $t = \max\{i \mid R_i \text{ is normal}\}$. For $1 \le i \le t$ let $\phi_i : \dfrac{R_0}{(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1})} \twoheadrightarrow \dfrac{R_i}{(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1})}$. We have that each ϕ_i is an isomorphism. In particular, $\mathrm{e}(R_i) = \mathrm{e}$, for all $i \le t$; also for $i \le t$, R_i is Gorenstein.

If we now write $\mathfrak{m}_{R_0} = (\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}) + J_i$ where $\mu(J_i) = \mu(\mathfrak{m}_{R_0}) - d$ and w_{i+1} is a minimal generator of J_i, we have $(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}) : \mathfrak{m}_{R_0}^2 = (\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}) : J_i^2$. Note that $\mathfrak{m}_{R_i} = (\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}) + J_i$ (minimally). The isomorphism ϕ_i now gives that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}) :_{R_i} \mathfrak{m}_{R_i}^2}{(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1})} &= \frac{\left((\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}) :_{R_0} J_i^2\right) R_i + (\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1})}{(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1})} \\ &= \frac{\left((\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}) :_{R_0} \mathfrak{m}_{R_0}^2\right) R_i + (\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1})}{(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1})}\end{aligned}$$

Since $R_0' = \dfrac{R_0}{(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1})} \to R_i' = \dfrac{R_i}{(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1})}$ is an isomorphism of R_0-algebras we note that because the images of J_i are minimal generators in the domain, they must be minimal generators in the codomain as well. Moreover, $\mathrm{Ann}_{R_0'}(\mathfrak{m}_0^2)$ maps to $\mathrm{Ann}_{R_i'}(\mathfrak{m}_i^2)$ under the mentioned isomorphism, and so the minimal set of generators A_i is a set of generators for

$$\frac{(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}) :_{R_i} \mathfrak{m}_{R_i}^2}{(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1})},$$

and $w_{i+1} z \notin (\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1})$ for $z \in A_i$ because $(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}) \cap R_0 = (\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1})$.

Moreover, $\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}$ for a minimal reduction for $\mathfrak{m}_{R_0}$ hence $\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}$ form a minimal reduction for $\mathfrak{m}_{R_i}$. We also need that $v_1, \dots, v_i, w_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \dots, x_d$ form a minimal reduction of $\mathfrak{m}_{R_i}$.

When $k < \mathrm{e} - 2$, $w_{i+1} \notin (\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}) : \mathfrak{m}_{R_0}^2$. Since $\mathrm{Ann}_{R_0'}(\mathfrak{m}_0^2)$ maps to $\mathrm{Ann}_{R_i'}(\mathfrak{m}_i^2)$ under the isomorphism $R_0' \to R_i'$ we get that $w_{i+1} \notin (\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}) : \mathfrak{m}_{R_i}^2$. Finally if $k = \mathrm{e} - 2$, then $w_{i+1} \in A_i$ by our initial choice.

This shows that Theorem 6.6 may be applied to the extension $R_i \to R_{i+1}$ if R_i is F-regular, i.e., that w_{i+1} satisfies the necessary conditions to be chosen as the z in Theorem 6.6.

We make several observations about the case that we may obtain an R_d in the above manner. If we write $\mathfrak{m}_{R_0} = (w_1, \dots, w_d) + J$ with $\mu(J) = \mu(\mathfrak{m}_{R_0}) - d$, then $\mathfrak{m}_{R_d} = (v_1, \dots, v_d) + J$. Thus every generator of J is in $\overline{(w_1, \dots, w_d) R_d} = \overline{(v_1^n, \dots, v_d^n) R_d} = \overline{\mathfrak{m}_{R_d}^n}$. In addition, we note that via the isomorphism ϕ_d we may filter $R_d/(v_1, \dots, v_d))$, by essentially the same filtration as we take of $R_0/(w_1, \dots, w_d)$. Let $r = \max\{j \mid (\mathfrak{m}_{R_0}^j + (w_1, \dots, w_d))/(w_1, \dots, w_d) \neq 0\}$. We may then take a socle generator $u \in \mathfrak{m}_{R_0}^r$, modulo $(\mathbf{w}_d)$. The same element will now represent a socle element in $R_d/(\mathbf{v}_d)$, and will have valuation at least rn. Hence, if $rn \geq d$ then by the Briançon-Skoda Theorem, $u \in (\mathbf{v}_d)^*$, and R_d is not F-regular.

In particular, if $n \geq \lceil d/2 \rceil$ (if $k = \mathrm{e} - 2$), or $n \geq \lceil d/3 \rceil$ (if $k < \mathrm{e} - 2$, by Lemma 6.4), the ring R_d cannot be F-regular.

Choose such n and let $s = \max\{i : R_i \text{ is F-regular}\}$. Note $s < d$, and hence R_{s+1} is not F-regular.

In each application of the theorem, $b = n$, so we obtain from Theorem 6.6, for each $i \leq t$ (or $i < d$ if $t = d$) that

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_i) \geq \begin{cases} 1 + \dfrac{\mathrm{e} - 2}{\mathrm{e}\, n - 2}(\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{i+1}) - 1) & \text{if } k = \mathrm{e} - 2; \\ 1 + \dfrac{k+1}{(n-1)\,\mathrm{e} + k + 1}(\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{i+1}) - 1) & \text{if } k < \mathrm{e} - 2. \end{cases}$$

By Corollary 3.10 [2], $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_{s+1}) \geq 1 + 1/d$.

Hence

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_0) \geq \begin{cases} 1 + \left(\dfrac{\mathrm{e} - 2}{\mathrm{e}\, n - 2}\right)^{s+1} \left(\dfrac{\mathrm{e}}{2} - 1\right) & \text{if } k = \mathrm{e} - 2; \\ 1 + \left(\dfrac{k+1}{(n-1)\,\mathrm{e} + k + 1}\right)^{s+1} \left(\dfrac{1}{d}\right) & \text{if } k < \mathrm{e} - 2. \end{cases}$$

We then get the following lower bounds for non-regular rings, using that we may assume that $6 \leq \mathrm{e} \leq d!$, $k \geq 3$:

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R_0) \geq \begin{cases} 1 + \left(\dfrac{4}{6\lceil d/2 \rceil - 2}\right)^{d} \cdot 2 & \text{if } k = \mathrm{e} - 2; \\ 1 + \left(\dfrac{4}{(\lceil d/3 \rceil) d! + 4}\right)^{d} \left(\dfrac{1}{d}\right) & \text{if } k < \mathrm{e} - 2. \end{cases}$$

Therefore we can state the final result:

Theorem 6.7. *Let R be a local Gorenstein F-regular ring of dimension $d \geq 2$ and Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity $\mathrm{e} \geq 6$ and positive characteristic $p > 2$. Let $k = \operatorname{embdim}(R) - \dim(R)$. Assume further that R is not a complete intersection.*

Then if $\mathrm{e} \geq d! + 1$ then $\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq 1 + \frac{1}{d!}$. Otherwise

$$\mathrm{e}_{HK}(R) \geq \begin{cases} 1 + \left(\dfrac{4}{6\lceil d/2 \rceil - 2}\right)^{d} \cdot 2 & \text{if } k = \mathrm{e} - 2; \\ 1 + \left(\dfrac{4}{(\lceil d/3 \rceil) d! + 4}\right)^{d} \left(\dfrac{1}{d}\right) & \text{if } k < \mathrm{e} - 2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. It suffices to remind the reader that the first claim is well-known (see [4]). The last inequality is what we have proved in Section 6. □

References

[1] I. M. Aberbach, *Extension of weakly and strongly F-regular rings by flat maps* J. Alg., 241 (2001), 799–807.

[2] I. M. Aberbach, F. Enescu, *Lower bounds for Hilbert-Kunz multiplicities in local rings of fixed dimension*, Michigan Math. Journal, 57 (2008), 1–16 (volume in honor of M. Hochster).

[3] I. M. Aberbach, G. Leuschke, *The F-signature and strong F-regularity*, Math. Res. Lett. 10 (2003), no. 1, 51–56.

[4] M. Blickle, F. Enescu, *On rings with small Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 132 (2004), no. 9, 2505–2509.

[5] R. O. Buchweitz, Q. Chen, *Hilbert-Kunz Functions of Cubic Curves and Surfaces*, J. Algebra 197, 246-267 (1997).

[6] O. Celikbas, H. Dao, C. Huneke, Y. Zhang, Bounds on the Hilbert-Kunz Multiplicity, arXiv:1102.5101.

[7] D. Chakerian, D. Logothetti, *Cube Slices, Pictorial Triangles, and Probability*, Math. Magazine, vol. 64, no. 4, Oct 1991, 219—241.

[8] F. Enescu, K. Shimomoto, *On the upper semi-continuity of the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity*, J. Algebra 285, no. 1, 222–237 (2005).

[9] K. Eto, K.-i. Yoshida, *Notes on the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicitiy of Rees Algebra*, Comm. Alg. vol. 31 (2003) no. 12, 5943–5976.

[10] S. Goto, Y. Nakamura, *Multiplicity and tight closures of parameters*, J. Algebra 244 (2001), no. 1, 302–311

[11] D. Hanes, *Notes on the Hilbert-Kunz function*, J. Algebra 265 (2003), no. 2, 619–630.

[12] M. Hochster and C. Huneke, *Tight closure, invariant theory, and the Briançon-Skoda Theorem*, J. AMS 3, 31–116, (1990).

[13] C. Huneke, *Tight closure and its applications*, Tight closure and its applications. With an appendix by Melvin Hochster. CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, 88, 1996.

[14] C. Huneke, Y. Yao, *Unmixed local rings with minimal Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity are regular*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc, 130 (2002), no. 3, 661–665.

[15] K. Kurano, *The singular Riemann-Roch theorem and Hilbert-Kunz functions*, J. Algebra 304 (2006), no. 1, 487–499.

[16] P. Monsky, I. Gessel *The limit as $p \to \infty$ of the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity of $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^{d_i}$*, preprint, 2010, arXiv:AC/1007.2004.

[17] D. Northcott, D. Rees, *Reductions of ideals in local rings*, Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc 50 (1954), 145–158.

[18] D. Rees, *Valuations associated with ideals. II*, J. London Math. Soc. 31 (1956) 228–235.

[19] J. Sally, *Cohen-Macaulay local rings of maximal embedding dimension*, J. Algebra 56 (1979), no. 1, 168–183.

[20] ——, *Tangent cones at Gorenstein singularities*, Compositio Math., vol. 40, Fasc. 2, (1980) 167–175.

[21] ——, *Number of generators of ideals in local rings*, Marcel Dekker Inc. New York.

[22] I. Swanson, C. Huneke, *Integral closure of ideals, rings, and modules*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 336. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.

[23] K.-i. Watanabe, K.-i.Yoshida, *Hilbert-Kunz Multiplicity and an Inequality between Multiplicity and Colength*, J. Algebra 230, 295-317 (2000).

[24] ——, *Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity of two dimensional local rings*, Nagoya Math. J. 162 (2001), 87-110.

[25] ——, *Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity of three-dimensional local rings*, Nagoya Math. J. 177 (2005), 47–75.

[26] Wolfram Research, Inc., Mathematica, Version 7.0, Champaign, IL (2008).

[27] K.-i. Yoshida *Small Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity and (A_1)-type singularity*, Proc. of the 4th Japan-Vietnam Joint Seminar on Commutative Algebra by and for young mathematicians, 2009.

Department of Mathematics, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211
E-mail address: `aberbachi@missouri.edu`

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30303
E-mail address: `fenescu@gsu.edu`